

MEMO

Long Range Planning

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee

FROM: Long Range Planning Staff

DATE: October 27, 2000

**SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
October 26, 2000**

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Darrell Alder	City of Washougal Council Member (P)
Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member (P)
Jay Cervený	City of La Center (P)
Paul Dennis	City of Camas
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member (A)
Michael Heffin	City of Ridgefield
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member (P)
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judy Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

Public:

Deb Wallace	C-TRAN
Marnie Allen	Clark County Schools
Ken Hadley	Self
George Vartanian	Self
Neil Olsen	CCHBA
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Scott Patterson	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mike Conway	City of Washougal Public Works Director
Tamara De Ridder	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager

Richard Lowry
Dale Miller
Oliver Orjiako
Marty Snell
Bryan Snodgrass
Phil Wuest

Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Clark County Long Range Planning
Clark County Long Range Planning
City of Camas Planning Manager
Clark County Long Range Planning
Clark County Long Range Planning

Introductions / Roll Call

Called to order at 4:00 PM by Commissioner Craig Pridemore. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

Approve October 18 Steering Committee Notes

Notes were not yet available.

Urban Reserve Issues

Derek Chisholm made a brief presentation on Policy Paper #12 – Planning the Urban Reserves. Chisholm referred to Chapter 12 of the Comprehensive Plan and two specific policies. Under the Procedural Guidelines, the plan states “Boundary amendments may be approved only when it is shown by the proponent (county or city) that the supply of available land is insufficient to accommodate anticipated growth. Criteria used to determine where and how much land should be added to the urban area are:

The amendment shall be within an urban reserve or urban reserve overlay area.

The amendment shall not include lands that are designated as natural resources (agriculture, forest, mineral resources) unless the lands are designated with an industrial urban reserve overlay or urban reserve overlay.”

Policy 2.5.5 states:

“All new divisions of land shall create lots of 10 or more acres in size.”

Policy 2.6.8 states:

“The inclusion of land for industrial purposes within the urban growth area requires retention of industrial zoning for a period of not less than (7) years.”

Chisholm summarized the section “What makes people question the policy” then presented the policy options for change. The options for change are (1) to take advantage of planning already done and add standards to ensure that URA’s can provide for future urban expansion, (2) create urban holding zones that can be conditionally developed when coordinated plans are completed from infrastructure providers and (3) look at specific short-lived uses that would not impede later development.

Pat Lee added that urban reserve is a tool that has been developed locally and is not a state mandate. Jack Burkman asked if the TAC had a preference. Lee responded that in an effort to help facility siting, they were inclined to the more proactive approach. Burkman wanted to know if the Urban holding designation would affect the rate of development. Lee responded that to the extent they are within the UGB they are under market influences. Rich Lowry says the question is whether to bring in land now or plan an area before it is ready for urbanization. The difference between industrial and non-industrial was raised. Lee responded that there wasn't a differentiation but that it allowed for industrial master plan zones that can move ahead before annual review. Lowry sees it as two-step process the latter is a legislative sunset clause, but the only option is to have a known user and meet the statutory condition of not having any available land within the UGB.

Commissioner Pridemore provided an FYI regarding an anticipated report from CREDC that will show a significant reduction in industrial lands and a reconvening of the Plan Monitoring TAC (made up of representatives of the Responsible Growth Forum and Friends of Clark County) to revisit some of the planning assumptions. Burkman asked if the infrastructure assumptions would be revisited. Commissioner Pridemore responded that he is not inclined to revisit the issue but encouraged any new information to be forward to the Plan Monitoring TAC. Oliver Orjiako pointed out that the Vacant Buildable Lands model maintains 25% allocation for industrial and commercial lands and 38% for residential lands. Will the timing question of when they are brought in be a concern? Rich Lowry said that if you bring the land into Urban Holding zone it may be open to legal challenge, but if the land is kept as urban reserve and pre-planning is done the likelihood of a challenge will be minimized. Commissioner Pridemore asked if staff had a list or an idea of the level of planning needed. Lee responded that the level of planning is dependent on how quickly we anticipate the land being urbanized. Burkman asked if there was a mechanism for bringing in more urban reserves as supply is decreased. Lee responded that staff was open to explore additional urban reserves through the process and in the future. Burkman said that it was difficult to see the downside of doing more planning.

Capital Facilities / Comprehensive Plan Consistency issues

Dale Miller presented Policy Paper #13 Ensuring Land Use Plan and Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) consistency. Miller stated the basic premise is to plan for growth and come up with the Capital Facilities Plan for that growth. He highlighted four of the most important policy provisions.

RCW 36.70A.110 (2) – "...population projection made for the county by the Office of Financial Management... shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth... for the succeeding 20 year period."

RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(iv)(C) – "If probable funding fall short of meeting identified needs, a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards shall be met."

RCW 36.70A.070 (3)(e) - "...reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities element, and financing plan within the CFP element are coordinated and consistent."

RCW 36.70A.215 (4) - "... the county and its cities shall adopt and implement measures that are reasonably likely to increase consistency during the subsequent five-year period..."

Miller said, the bottom line is to provide enough infrastructure to meet projected growth and have the ability to pay for that level of service. The three types of infrastructure with direct concurrency requirements mandated by GMA are roads, water, and sewer. Equally important are indirect concurrency systems such as public schools, parks, fire protection, law enforcement & corrections, solid waste disposal, government facilities...The implications of not meeting concurrency standards could result in moratoriums, so revenue discussions are critical.

Other issues of interest according to Miller were a need for annual reviews to make sure expenditures and CFP's are consistent. How much revenue should be devoted to the cost of operations and maintenance? What are the implications of density and its impact on growth? What is the timing of infrastructure allocation? He mentioned the TAC discussion centered on getting revenue projections (financial data) that will provide a firmer approach. He anticipates allocations in the spring time and having the CFP in the summer months. He emphasized the need to be flexible with Population and Employment forecasts and Level of Service standards.

Burkman asked, given the population and employment allocations isn't land use type needed to determine cost? Miller responded that the process is not clean and requires flexibility with level of service. Burkman asked what the minimum adopted LOS on OFM projection if funding falls short? Miller replied that either additional funding needs to be secured or land use element needs to be balanced. Miller spoke of the process undertaken in 1994 when the LOS was chosen first. The county couldn't afford the plan and was remanded because it wasn't balanced. Commissioner Pridemore asked if LOS is constantly moving or does it get locked in? Miller responded quality of life (LOS) that is acceptable needs to have a way to pay for itself. Mike Conway said there are services with concurrency area expectations but nothing compelling it. Parks for example have a goal of five acres per thousand population, but if the community wants them they will have to pay for them. Some services like water and sewer have LOS that cannot be changed, with most other services there is some flexibility and trade-off can be made. The question of whether we are essentially choosing our LOS when we chose a population was asked. Miller responded that transportation costs are pretty fixed and if you have high impact fees that discourage people from moving in it creates a catch-22 with the indirect CFP.

Technical Advisory Committee Update

Pat Lee told the Steering Committee that the TAC had discussed the questions pertaining to the 60/40 and 6/16 issues raised at the October 18, 2000 Steering Committee meeting. The TAC is also working on a population and employment allocation methodology but is still waiting for employment numbers from the State.

Next Meeting Time and Date

Next meeting is scheduled for November 21, 2000 at the Fisher's Landing Transit Center.

Adjourned

The Steering Committee adjourned at 5:15 PM.